Editor's Note: In the original Supplemental Material, the legend for Figure S3 was incorrect. The size of the square does not reflect the relative number of participants in each group but instead reflects the relative precision of the estimate. Larger squares represent more precision. The figure legend has been corrected.

Note to readers with disabilities: *EHP* strives to ensure that all journal content is accessible to all readers. However, some figures and Supplemental Material published in *EHP* articles may not conform to 508 standards due to the complexity of the information being presented. If you need assistance accessing journal content, please contact <a href="mailto:ehp508@niehs.nih.gov">ehp508@niehs.nih.gov</a>. Our staff will work with you to assess and meet your accessibility needs within 3 working days.

## **Supplemental Material**

## Particulate Matter Exposure and Cardiopulmonary Differences in the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis

Carrie P. Aaron, Yana Chervona, Steven M. Kawut, Ana V. Diez Roux, Mingwu Shen, David A. Bluemke, Victor C. Van Hee, Joel D. Kaufman, and R. Graham Barr

## **Table of Contents**

**Table S1:** City-specific and overall correlations between PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> exposures

**Table S2:** Mean differences in RV mass, end-diastolic volume, mass/end-diastolic volume ratio, stroke volume and ejection fraction adjusted for LV parameters per 5  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup> increase in ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> exposure, stratified by city

**Table S3:** Mean differences in RV mass, end-diastolic volume, mass/end-diastolic volume ratio, stroke volume and ejection fraction adjusted for LV parameters per 5  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup> increase in ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> and individually-weighted PM<sub>2.5</sub> exposure, with a random effect for city

**Table S4:** Mean differences in RV mass, end-diastolic volume, mass/end-diastolic volume ratio, stroke volume and ejection fraction adjusted for LV parameters and NO<sub>2</sub> exposure per 5  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup> increase in ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> (N=4,028) and individually-weighted PM<sub>2.5</sub> (N=3,368) exposure

**Table S5:** Characteristics of participants with ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> measured and the subset with individually-weighted PM<sub>2.5</sub>

Figure S1: Hypothesized causal diagram

Figure S2: Description of the study sample

**Figure S3:** Sensitivity analyses for the multivariable association of individually-weighted PM<sub>2.5</sub> exposure and RV mass adjusted for LV mass and city. Shown are the mean differences (■) and 95% confidence limits for a 5 μg/m³ change in PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The size of the square reflects the relative precision of the estimate. Larger squares represent more precision. Multivariable model: adjusted for age, sex, race/ethnicity, height, weight, education, income, neighborhood SES index, smoking status, packyears, total cholesterol, HDL, hypertension, systolic blood pressure, fasting glucose, diabetes, C-reactive protein, left ventricular mass and city. P-interactions: sex 0.69, race/ethnicity 0.003, age group 0.18, smoking status 0.71, airflow limitation 0.28, emphysema 0.86.